DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 386 468 TM 023 839

AUTHOR Shannon, David M.; And Others
TITLE Implementing a Portfolio-Based Evaluation System for Preservice Teachers.
PUB DATE 19 Apr 95
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Education Majors; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Portfolios (Background Materials); *Program Implementation; *Self Evaluation (Individuals); Teacher Certification; Teacher Education; *Teacher Evaluation; *Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS *Preservice Teachers

ABSTRACT

This paper provides an overview of a portfolio-based teacher evaluation system at Auburn University (Alabama) designed to promote self-assessment, reflection, and professional growth of preservice teachers. This system was developed and implemented in response to a state mandate that all preservice teachers, prior to recommendation for state certification, pass a comprehensive, exit examination. This portfolio system has been introduced, revised, and expanded gradually over the past two years. Feedback gathered from participants (i.e., interns and university intern supervisors) has helped in the refinement of both the portfolio process and product. A discussion of the phases of development and evolution of the portfolio evaluation system and feedback gathered from participants is provided. As the portfolio system has evolved, so have a number of issues regarding definition and purpose, portfolio components and their selection, evaluation, faculty and administrator support and involvement, and curriculum revision. The college has dealt with many of these issues in developing the portfolio and is still dealing with others as portfolio implementation and revision continue to raise new questions. An overview of efforts toward these issues is provided. (Contains 36 references.) (Author/SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 386 468

Running Head: PORTFOLIO-BASED EVALUATION SYSTEM

Implementing a Portfolio-Based Evaluation System for Preservice Teachers

David M. Shannon
Barbara Ash
Nancy H. Barry
Caroline Dunn

Auburn University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
DAVID M. SHANNON
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), San Francisco, CA, April 19, 1995

Author Note: Please address all correspondence to the first author at:
2084 Haley Center, Auburn University, AL 36849-5221,
(205) 844-3071, FAX (205) 844-3072, E-mail: SHANNDM@mail.auburn.edu

TM023859

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper provides an overview of a portfolio-based teacher evaluation system designed to promote self-assessment, reflection, and professional growth of preservice teachers. This system was developed and implemented in response to a state mandate that all preservice teachers, prior to recommendation for state certification, pass a comprehensive, exit examination. This portfolio system has been introduced, revised, and expanded gradually over the past two years. Feedback gathered from participants (i.e., interns, university intern supervisors) has helped us refine both the portfolio process and product. A discussion of the phases of development and evolution of the portfolio evaluation system and feedback gathered from participants is provided.

As our portfolio system has evolved, so have a number of issues regarding definition and purpose, portfolio components and their selection, evaluation, faculty and administrator support and involvement, and curriculum revision. Our college has dealt with many of these issues in developing the portfolio and is still dealing with others as portfolio implementation and revision continues to raise new questions. An overview of the efforts we have made in addressing these issues is provided.

Implementing a Portfolio-Based Evaluation System for Preservice Teachers

The number of states mandating certification assessment has rapidly increased from 3 in 1977 to 45 in 1994 (Association of Teacher Educators, 1988; Delandshire, 1994; Eissenburg & Rudner, 1988; Sandefur, 1985; Shannon & Boll, 1995). Such state mandates typically result in the administration of assessment(s) which are consistent for all candidates applying for state certification, most often taking the form of a standardized multiple-choice test. A recent study indicates that 41 of the 45 states requiring some method of assessment for certification purposes used pencil-and-paper tests (Shannon & Boll, 1995). These tests are used because they are readily available and, relative to other methods of assessment, they are inexpensive. Such multiple-choice type examinations can also be administered to large groups and scored promptly, with little difficulty.

Like most states, the State of Alabama mandates that all students in teacher preparation pass a comprehensive exit examination prior to being recommended for state certification. Unlike other states, however, the choice of the specific assessment method(s) is left up to the individual institution offering the teacher education program. The Alabama mandate required each institution to determine the nature of their certification assessment, stipulating only that both the measurement of content and professional knowledge be included in the institution's overall plan. Under the mandate, institutions were required to submit their plans to the state department for review. Upon approval of their plans, each college or university then assumed the responsibility of developing and implementing their certification assessment. Currently, recommendations for state certification are based on the results of

these assessment processes.

A total of 27 institutions were required to comply with this state mandate. In response, 25 of these 27 institutions opted for some form of a pencil-and-paper test. Sixteen of these 25 institutions have chosen to base their recommendation for state certification solely on the results of a written examination. Some programs decided to supplement a written examination with other methods of assessment such as oral examinations (n=5), performance assessment (n=5), and portfolios (n=3).

Auburn University is one of only two institutions that does not require a written test. The preservice teacher evaluation system in operation at Auburn currently consists of a candidate-constructed portfolio. A simulation exercise in pedagogical decision-making will supplement the portfolio. The simulation exercise is still under development and has not yet been administered as part of the overall evaluation system. More information regarding the specific nature of this simulation can be found elsewhere (Shannon, Medley, & Hays, 1993a; Shannon, Medley, & Hays, 1993b).

Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to provide an overview of the development and evolution of the portfolio-based evaluation system for preservice teachers at Auburn University. This portfolio system has been introduced, revised, and expanded gradually over the past two years. But, since our preservice teachers have not completed the fully expanded portfolio, the system is still not fully in place. And since we continue to wrestle with issues surrounding the implementation of our envisioned portfolio, our assessment system is still developing.

The first section of this paper focuses on the initial development and implementation of the portfolio and specific feedback gathered from those preservice teachers (interns) and university supervisors involved. How this feedback was used to make revisions is addressed in the second section of the paper. The third section provides further discussion of the revisions made to expand the portfolio system and integrate it within the teacher education curriculum. The final section identifies some issues we have faced and others we are still facing in the implementation of our envisioned portfolio evaluation system.

Auburn Preservice Teacher Evaluation System

The first step in developing this evaluation system was to establish an exit examination committee consisting of members from different departments in the College of Education. This committee was charged with reviewing the alternatives which complied with the state mandate and recommending an exit examination plan for the college.

In our review of teacher evaluation methods (Shannon & Boll, 1994), we found that methods of teacher assessment have generally included pencil-and-paper tests and classroom observations. These methods have often been criticized because they provide a limited view of teaching (Bird, 1990; Darling-Hammond, 1988; Scriven, 1988, Shulman & Sykes, 1986) and fail to capture the interrelationships of content area, pedagogical knowledge, and situational factors (e.g., student diversity, school environment). Consequently, the profession has issued a call for the use of multiple or alternative assessment methods (Furthwengler, 1986; Haertel, 1991; Shulman, 1988).

Portfolios provide one such alternative. Portfolios include performance-based elements and they allow the teacher (or student teacher) to reflect upon the specific context in

which teaching occurs (Smolen & Newman, 1992; Wolf, 1991a, 1991b; Zubizarreta, 1994). At the completion of a four-year study exploring and developing new methods of teacher evaluation, the Teacher Assessment Project (TAP) recommended two approaches: simulation exercises and portfolios (Shulman, 1989). This recommendation has led to the establishment of the Ohio Consortium for Portfolio Development (OCPD) (Berry, Kisch, Ryan, & Uphoff, 1991), the use of portfolios for national certification (Bradley, 1992; NBPTS, 1992), and the gradual integration of portfolios into preservice teacher education programs.

Drawing on feedback from college faculty and existing literature, the Exit Examination Committee designed an evaluation plan which requires each student (i.e., candidate for certification) to complete an exit portfolio. The exit portfolio was first implemented during the spring quarter of 1993. The requirements for the portfolio have been gradually expanded since this time. The specific requirements for this portfolio plan have also been revised since then based on quarterly feedback from students and university supervisors.

Phase 1 - Initial Exit Portfolio (Spring 1993)

The exit portfolio plan was first implemented during the spring 1993 quarter with the intention to continue refining and expanding the requirements of the exit evaluation plan over the next year. The initial exit portfolio requirements were kept to a minimum so that they could be completed during the duration of the student's 10-week internship. The majority of these requirements were ones that interns would be completing during the ordinary course of the 10-week internship. The required five components included:

(a) a **professional resume**,

provide evidence of a teacher candidate's skills, attitudes, and values that cannot be gathered from a resume alone. Interns, however, were more likely to perceive portfolios as a "showcase" of a teacher's work, while supervisors and employers were more likely to view portfolios as an opportunity for self-reflection. Each group also identified portfolios as useful in (a) fostering the professional development of teachers and (b) measuring teachers' pedagogical knowledge. Supervisors and employers were more likely to find portfolios useful in (a) clarifying the major responsibilities of teaching and (b) providing the employer with valuable information about a student teacher's potential to become an effective teacher. Each group identified several components including (a) a professional resume, (b) lesson plans, and (c) a teaching philosophy statement as essential to include in a portfolio. Interns were more likely to suggest the inclusion of a classroom management plan and a student discipline policy. On the other hand, supervisors were more likely to suggest unit plans and student evaluation instruments.

What difficulties were encountered during the development of the initial exit portfolio? Dunn and Shepperson (1994) reported that the classroom management plan was identified as the most difficult component of the pilot portfolio. The main reasons cited for the difficulty of this component included (a) the limited amount of guidance provided, (b) the limited attention given to classroom management in coursework, (c) the lack of actual classroom experience upon which to base the plan, (d) the inappropriateness of this component for specific certification areas, and (e) the difficulty they had putting their thoughts and ideas about this topic into writing. Other concerns were expressed within specific program areas (e.g., early childhood, special education) regarding the appropriate

format of lesson plans and student evaluation instruments.

Both interns and university supervisors were in agreement in identifying time as the major difficulty in developing the portfolio during the internship. There simply was not enough time during this period to develop the portfolio adequately. Other notable difficulties for the interns included the lack of preparation for developing and organizing a portfolio. The major suggestions for preventing these difficulties were (a) integrating portfolio development with existing coursework, (b) beginning the process before internship, and (c) providing examples of the portfolio components.

Phase 2 - Revised Portfolio Requirements (Fall 1993)

Based on this feedback, the requirements for the exit portfolio were revised. The five required components for the 1993-94 academic year were:

(a) a **professional resume**,

(b) a **self-evaluation** of one's teaching ability (*Teaching Self-Evaluation*),

(c) a **lesson plan** which proved **most successful** in its execution,

(d) a **lesson plan** which proved **least successful** in its execution, and

(e) a **student evaluation instrument**.

Although the classroom management plan was dropped from the list of portfolio requirements, the topic of classroom management was not. Instead of writing a management plan for a classroom setting in which they expected to work, interns were required to write about their actual classroom management during internship. In other words, classroom management was contextualized in terms of a specific setting, the intern's classroom. As part of the self-evaluation, each intern was asked to cite two examples of his/her management

plan in action; one example had to address an instance in which the intern encouraged appropriate student behavior; the other, an instance in which the intern discouraged inappropriate behavior. In each case, the intern was required to write reflectively about experience, explaining not only how his or her actions proved effective, but also indicating what he or she might have done to be more effective.

Perhaps the most significant change in the portfolio was to incorporate more "reflection" in the portfolios. As stated in the interns' portfolio guidelines, the purpose of the *Teaching Self-Evaluation* was "for [interns] to reflect upon the knowledge, skills, and qualities that [they] have acquired during [their] teacher training program at Auburn University." The areas included in this self-evaluation were drawn from the competencies that the State of Alabama recognizes as essential for effective teaching. For each competency, interns were given a "reflection question" and a "response guideline" to help them structure their reflective writing. Below is an example of a reflection question and accompanying response guideline for the competency area of Classroom Organization and Environment.

Reflection: What have I learned that will enable me to establish and maintain an appropriate environment for learning?

Response: Cite one example illustrating your ability to provide an appropriate learning environment and explain why it would be successful.

Reflection was not limited to the *Teaching Self-Evaluation*. Each intern was also required to write reflective statements to accompany the lesson plans (most and least successful) and the student evaluation instrument or process. To help guide interns in their

reflective writing, questions were included in the guidelines packet. In writing about the most and least successful lesson plans, interns were asked to consider these questions:

1. What was the context of your lesson plan?
2. What made the plan most/least successful?
3. What insight(s) have you gained from looking back at what happened when you executed your plan; or what realization(s) have you attained?

In writing about the evaluation instrument or process, interns were asked to consider similar questions:

1. What was the context of the evaluation?
2. What pleased or displeased you about the evaluation instrument or process itself and/or its results?
3. What one specific insight have you gained as a result of using the evaluation instrument or process; or what one specific realization have you attained regarding the evaluation instrument or process?

Guidelines were also provided to both interns and intern supervisors about the evaluation of interns' reflective writing. Reflections were to be evaluated by the university supervisor, using three criteria:

A. Clear in expression (Does the reflection make sense?)

B. Sufficient in insight or realization (Is there something more than cliched thought, "pat" understanding, and general platitudes?)

C. Unflawed in mechanics (Is the reflection basically free from errors in usage, spelling, and punctuation?)

Another change in the revised portfolio was the reduction of the requirements from two weeks of lesson plans to just two plans. In this revised portfolio, the intern must be more selective in choosing one plan which he or she considers most successful; and the other, least successful. Planning is also addressed in the *Teaching Self-Evaluation*. As stated in the portfolio guidelines, the term *lesson plan* can be interpreted in the following ways:

(a) A lesson plan for a particular unit, subject, or period

(b) A plan for an activity for a particular unit, subject, or period

(c) A plan for some aspect of an extended unit of study

(d) The overall plan for an extended unit of study

The overall portfolio was still evaluated as either *satisfactory* or *unsatisfactory* by the university supervisor. Upon completion of a satisfactory portfolio, the intern was to be recommended for state certification. Under this system, a student might pass the internship, even graduate, but still have portfolio revisions to make before being recommended for certification.

As can be seen in this second phase, the portfolio was evolving from less of an evaluation instrument administered by the "outsider" to more of a tool for an individual candidate's own reflection and self-evaluation (Ash, 1994).

Phase 3 - Expansion and Integration of Portfolio (Fall 1994 - Present)

Up until this point, each candidate for certification has completed the requirements for the portfolio during his or her 10-week internship. As indicated by interns from Spring Quarter 1993 (n=202) and Spring Quarter 1994 (n=169), limited amount of time has been a

significant problem for interns. The internship is a very demanding experience. The addition of another requirement increases the workload and the level of frustration. One intern even commented that having to complete a portfolio during internship took time away from other things she/he believed were more important (e.g., preparing for lessons, student evaluations).

Time is especially a factor in the completion of the reflective writing and self-evaluation components of the portfolio. These components require time to think back over experience, as well as time to compose. A suggestion offered by interns was not to wait until the last minute, but to review the requirements carefully before and throughout the internship. Keeping a journal so that the details are readily available for use in the written reflections was also recommended.

To address the issue of time, students are now introduced to the exit portfolio requirements in their "orientation to teacher education" course. Students are encouraged to take the orientation course as soon as they have declared education as a major. In their "core" education courses and in their program-specific courses, students are also being reminded of the portfolio requirements.

The requirements for the exit portfolio have been expanded. In addition to the college-wide components described earlier, the expanded portfolio includes components determined by the student's major program area and those determined by the individual student. This expanded portfolio will be a requirement for students interning Fall 1995 and thereafter. An overview of these expanded portfolio requirements follows.

Section A - College-Wide Components. Some components are required for all

students in the College of Education. We have kept these components to a minimum. The five college-wide components currently required are those previously discussed (i.e., resume, self-evaluation, best lesson plan, worst lesson plan, and student evaluation). The college will continue to refine and modify these portfolio requirements as feedback continues to be gathered from participants in the portfolio process.

Section B - Program-Specific Components. Students are also required to include components specified by their program area. Each department was asked to determine the specific program areas responsible for deciding what components best reflect the knowledge and skills appropriate for students in their area. Each program area, in turn, identified a minimum of one portfolio component and a maximum of five. To help program areas determine specific components appropriate for inclusion in portfolios, the Exit Examination Committee presented a list of components derived from both the literature reviewed by the committee and the suggestions made by other parties involved in the portfolio development process (e.g., interns, university supervisors, and principals). Each program area faced the challenge of determining which specific components were most reflective of required coursework, field experiences, or other significant experiences that students engage in as part of their teacher preparation. In addition, the program area was asked to establish the criteria for the evaluation of each component.

Section C - Individual Components. The final category of portfolio components is determined by individual students. Each student selects components that supplement those already specified by the college or program area. A minimum of one portfolio component is required in this section, with the limit being five. Each component selected by the student

must be accompanied by a statement of reflection that explains the component and what it demonstrates about the candidate's present capabilities as a teacher and his/her potential for teaching. Guidelines for the selection of these portfolio components, including the list shared with program areas, have been included in the *Student Orientation Handbook* and are being discussed during orientation classes.

Issues in the Development and Implementation of a Portfolio-Based Evaluation System

The portfolio system at Auburn has evolved over time (and is still evolving). There has been increased input from interns, university supervisors and other college faculty, principals, and classroom teachers in helping to refine both the product and the process. As the portfolio system has evolved, a number of issues, some of which were identified by Wolf (1991b), have had to be addressed or are currently being addressed.

Some of the major issues include (a) the definition of the exit portfolio, (b) the purpose(s) of the exit portfolio, (c) the domains of teaching to be documented in the exit portfolio, (d) the components (evidence) to be included in the exit portfolio, (e) the selection of these components, (f) the evaluation of the exit portfolio, (g) faculty involvement in the portfolio process, (h) faculty and administrative support, and (i) curriculum revision. An overview of the efforts we have made in addressing each of these issues follows.

Definition of the exit portfolio. One of the first issues we faced in the developmental process was the very nature of portfolios. Should the exit portfolio be a "showcase" of a candidate's best work drawn form courses and the internship, or should it show the candidate's "development" over time? Careful consideration of the distinctions and implications of each approach led us to the recognition of the inherent developmental nature

of portfolios. We believe that a teacher's best work can only be accomplished over a long period of time and that good teachers continuously grow and refine their skills. Therefore, we decided on an approach that would allow for the revision of portfolio entries and the refinement of teaching ability based on feedback received throughout the process.

Wolf (1991a) defines a portfolio as "a structured collection of evidence of a teacher's best work that is selective, reflective, and collaborative, and demonstrates a teacher's accomplishments over time and across a variety of contexts" (p. 2). In accordance with this notion of portfolios, the current version of Auburn University's College of Education's (AUCOE) exit portfolio is introduced as students enter teacher education. From this point, each undergraduate student has a minimum of two years to select (and refine) components to be included in his or her exit portfolio. Portfolio components are intended to be selected so that they document the progress of the student over the course of his or her teacher preparation program.

Putting this definition into practice has taken some time. In the Spring Quarter of 1993 (the quarter we initiated the exit portfolio), it would not have been realistic to require a portfolio which was reflective and collaborative and demonstrated a candidate's accomplishments over time and across a variety of contexts, since students were limited to a period of the ten-week internship for completing the portfolio. Thus, we decided to implement our portfolio in phases, gradually increasing the number of requirements and making new demands on candidates (such as reflection and self-evaluation).

We are still wrestling with the collaborative element of the portfolio. Collaboration is not uniform in our current portfolio process. Whereas some students have the advantage of

collaborating with their advisor, other college faculty, cooperating teacher, university supervisor, and with peers, others may complete the portfolio entirely on their own. We are currently discussing the ways and means whereby all parties involved in preparing candidates for teaching can assist with exit portfolio preparation.

Purpose(s) of the exit portfolio. One of the purposes served by the portfolio must be evaluative. In the end, this evaluation is summative in that we must make a recommendation to the state about each student's candidacy for certification. However, of greater importance to us is enhancing the quality of candidates' teaching and helping candidates hone their reflective and self-evaluative skills. Therefore, a second purpose served by this portfolio process is that of improvement. We believe that teaching itself should be evaluated in a formative manner, providing teachers with feedback that can be used for improvement. We therefore intend for our exit portfolios to provide the same kind of assistance to preservice teachers.

We see the primary benefit of our exit portfolio as one which will give candidates opportunities to learn more about themselves as preservice teachers and to grow professionally. Therefore, the portfolio system is structured so candidates are engaged in continual reflection on their development as teachers; while interning, candidates also engage in self-evaluation of their teaching. Thus, the exit portfolio serves a formative purpose: meaningful feedback can be given to preservice teachers in order for them to improve their teaching knowledge and skill.

Our initial portfolio did not completely address our intended purpose. Although

interns were given the opportunity to revise portfolio components after receiving feedback, they were not afforded opportunities to engage in reflection and self-evaluation. These opportunities have been provided for in the current version of the exit portfolio.

But we hold another purpose for the exit portfolio that we have not yet fulfilled: to provide students with opportunities to make connections between and among the courses they have taken during their time in teacher education and to work through the conflicts and tensions they may have sensed among methods courses, courses in their "content areas," and the practices they remember from their own schooling. We reasoned that with such opportunities, students would be more likely to construct a coherent or integrated view of teaching. We believe that such a perspective is essential to good teaching.

However, the Exit Examination Committee members were late in articulating this goal to themselves; they have not, therefore, been able to clearly inform the program areas which are in charge of determining portfolio components for the "program-specific" section. The committee is currently making preparations to re-visit each program area both to explain the goal of helping students construct a coherent view of teaching and to solicit suggestions about what portfolio components, in general and in their area specifically, might fulfill this goal. Currently, several committee members have begun discussions with faculty in math education.

Domains of teaching documented in the portfolio. The specific domains included in our preservice teacher portfolio have been derived from the content of the current teacher education curriculum and teacher competencies mandated by the state (Alabama State Department of Education, 1992). The domains can be broadly divided into content-area and

pedagogical knowledge. These domains are further divided into areas such as classroom organization and management, planning, instruction, subject matter knowledge, assessment of student learning, and professional development.

These domains are consistent with those domains specified by Bird (1990) and Collins (1990b, 1991): (a) instruction, (b) planning and preparation, (c) student and program evaluation, (d) interaction with colleagues, and (e) interaction with parents and the community. These domains are also congruent with the NBPTS's Vision of Teaching, which outlines five core propositions that characterize highly accomplished teachers (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1993).

Components (evidence) included in the portfolio. Collins (1990b) differentiates between three types of components (evidence): (a) artifacts, (b) reproductions, and (c) reflections. Artifacts consist of materials that teachers normally produce such as tests, handouts, lesson plans, and letters to students and parents. Reproductions include videotapes, audiotapes, and pictures of bulletin boards. Reflections are explanations of and reasons for the decisions that teachers make. These reflective statements encourage the teacher to think about the teaching process and, thus, provide an opportunity for self-evaluation. The expanded version of our exit portfolio requires candidates to include evidence of all three types.

We saw it necessary to standardize some of the components required for the exit portfolio in order to gather uniform data across the many program areas in Auburn's teacher education program. Our initial portfolio consisted primarily of artifacts (e.g., student evaluation instrument, lesson plans, teaching materials). In the current portfolio, there are

currently five artifact components required for all students in the college. These components, with the exception of the resume, are accompanied by reflective statements. Beginning in the fall of 1995, candidate's portfolios will also include components which are representative of his/her major area of study. These program-specific components are intended to serve as evidence not just of a student's content-area knowledge, but also as evidence that he or she can teach this content. In addition, each student will include self-selected components accompanied by reflective statements explaining what each component is and what each demonstrates about the candidate as a person who has prepared and continues to prepare to teach.

Selection of portfolio components. Following the recommendation of Wolf (1991b), we have been very explicit about the format in which the components (evidence) must be prepared, but have grown more flexible in terms of what candidates may choose to represent themselves. Initially, the five required portfolio components were consistent for all students; even so, students still had freedom to choose specific items (e.g., candidates selected which particular lesson plans to include). Our current portfolio mandates a three-part selection process (i.e., college, program area, student), affording students greater flexibility in the selection of specific components. Within specific subject-area requirements, candidates select items within component categories. In addition, individuals have the opportunity to select additional items which best represent themselves as teacher candidates.

This process allows for greater opportunity to capture teaching in the context in which it has occurred. There is no one way to teach effectively. What makes an effective pre-school teacher does not necessarily make an effective high school science teacher. This

approach is very consistent with the recommendations made from the Teacher Assessment Project (TAP) (Collins, 1990b, Shulman, 1988). This approach is also consistent with that of the National Board in determining specific standards dependent upon a teacher's certification area (National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, 1993).

Evaluation of the exit portfolio. Perhaps the most difficult issue we have faced relates to evaluation. The evaluation of portfolios has raised many questions: (a) who will evaluate the portfolio?; (b) what criteria will be used?; (c) what scoring system will be used?; and (d) how will the validity be documented and reliability maintained? These are not easy questions to answer, but they still must be addressed in order for a portfolio assessment system to succeed. Our evaluation argument rests primarily in favor of validity. The flexibility built into the portfolio structure allows for a more accurate assessment of preservice teachers who are working in different teaching contexts. But the resulting diversity makes consistent evaluation difficult. Standardizing the contents of the portfolios for all preservice teachers would make this process easier in terms of reliability, but validity would suffer. We join Barton and Collins (1993) in agreement with Elbow (1991) that "it makes most sense to put our chips on validity and allow reliability to suffer" (Belanoff & Dickson, 1991, p. xiii).

During the development of a portfolio system, the establishment of criteria for each component of the portfolio is critical. In our case, the College requested specific program areas to develop evaluation criteria for each of their required components. Although each program area did respond with required portfolio components, most have not yet submitted specific evaluation criteria. Once these criteria are received, they will be shared with

preservice teachers and serve as guidelines for the development of their portfolios. Each component, as well as the overall portfolio, will be evaluated against the established criteria. Failure to meet these criteria will result in specific feedback on strengths and weaknesses so that the preservice teacher will have the opportunity to improve future performance.

A Committee on Standards and Evaluation was recently formed to examine the issues involved in the evaluation of the expanded college portfolio. This committee is charged with the responsibility to develop an evaluation system which (1) maintains high standards, (2) operates consistently and fairly, and (3) distributes equitably, as much as possible, the responsibility for evaluation among faculty and other stakeholders in the portfolio system. Discussions within this committee have raised a number of issues, most of which require the involvement of faculty from throughout the college.

Faculty involvement in the portfolio process. A great deal of involvement from specific program areas is essential to establish high standards and fairly apply them to the evaluation of portfolios. Faculty are best qualified to judge portfolios in their area of expertise. This, however, creates a problem in terms of the equitable distribution of responsibility. A few programs in the college (e.g., elementary education, early childhood) have the majority of the students and, as a result, the majority of the portfolios to be evaluated. The issues of expertise and equity led us to delegate the responsibility for the evaluation of portfolios to university supervisors for two reasons. First, the portfolio was initially completed during internship and the supervisor was in frequent contact with the intern during this time. Second, there is a reasonable limit on the number of interns a supervisor has each quarter, avoiding the unfair burden which might otherwise be placed on

faculty having more advisees. However, this decision means that all faculty throughout the College do not share the responsibility for portfolio evaluation. We are currently discussing means for involving faculty to a greater extent in the evaluation process.

A second issue emerging regards the formative, collaborative nature of the portfolio. Collaboration requires an ongoing exchange between the student and members of the faculty. It requires faculty to act as mentors who help students specify and clarify their views, which are constantly in a state of flux. Educating faculty about their role as mentors, maintaining consistency in mentoring, and assuring an equitable distribution of responsibility for mentoring are challenges we are struggling to meet.

A third issue faced pertains to the adjustment of faculty work load so that candidates' expanded portfolios can be developed and evaluated in a fair and consistent manner. Currently, candidates complete the bulk of their portfolios during internship because of the teaching experiences afforded to them during this period of time. Portfolios are also currently evaluated during the internship. Internships are often supervised, however, by adjunct faculty members because there are not enough full-time faculty to cover the intern supervision demand. Adjunct faculty are not as familiar with students or their program requirements as full-time faculty. If the portfolio is defined as evidence in support of a candidate's ability over time, there must be an established and ongoing dialogue between the intern and faculty; otherwise, the portfolio system will fall short of its intentions. We are still wrestling with how to adjust faculty's current responsibilities so they have the time necessary to work with students throughout the portfolio development and assessment process.

Administrative and faculty support. Both administrative and faculty support were essential in order for us to implement of our initial portfolio assessment system. Continued support is also essential for us to realize our expectations for our envisioned portfolio assessment. To help secure such support at the beginning of the process, the initial Exit Examination Committee was comprised of seven faculty members, two Associate Deans, and an Assistant Dean. This committee was chaired by the Associate Dean. This structure was established so that each academic department was represented in the development and implementation of the portfolio system. As the portfolio evolved, members of the committee discussed the committee's progress with each academic department and solicited their input. These discussions took place formally at scheduled department faculty meetings as well as informally between faculty members and their committee representative.

This communication between the committee and departments has been extremely important as the portfolio requirements expanded, requiring more input from specific program areas. Committee members continue to expend time and energy in their efforts to help program areas identify program-specific components and determine means of evaluation. Faculty in the program areas continue to struggle to meet the committee's expectations. For both parties to continue to work toward making the expanded portfolio a success, all concerned must see the task as important and as a priority of the college administration.

Curriculum revision. Another difficult challenge which currently confronts us regards the revision of the teacher education curriculum. We visualize the portfolio as an opportunity for students to reflect on their preparation and construct from their coursework and internship a "coherent view" of teaching. This expectation is fair only if, in fact, the

courses and program requirements do provide students with chances to reflect, make connections, and resolve conflicts. Helping faculty revise syllabi along these lines is a challenge yet to be faced.

The Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies, actively involved in the development of the exit portfolio, has consistently initiated discussion of possible curriculum and field experience modifications. The coordinated efforts of the exit examination committee and the undergraduate curriculum committee will be necessary in order to revise curriculum in such a way that the portfolio, as it has been envisioned, can reach its potential.

Summary

For two years, Auburn University has been using a portfolio-based system to evaluate candidates for initial teaching certification. This paper has provided an overview of the initial development and implementation of that system. It has also provided an explanation of and reasons for the system revisions that have taken place so far. In addition, we have discussed the changes we envision making in the future and the problems we face in implementing our envisioned portfolio evaluation system. With the implementation of the fully expanded portfolio, our assessment system will have grown from an internship-specific portfolio to one more integrated with coursework and developed by students over a period of time.

The success of this portfolio approach has yet to be determined. What is known is that continued faculty and administrator support, involvement, and cooperation are essential for us to realize our expectations for this portfolio-based evaluation system. We suspect that curriculum revision will also be necessary.

To develop and implement such a complex, college-wide system of evaluation has been difficult; what will be equally difficult is revising and maintaining this system. Many individual faculty in our college are using portfolios regularly with their students. Some of these faculty have been using portfolios before the initiation of our college-wide portfolio while others have begun as a result of our college-wide efforts. It is important, therefore, to consider the portfolio from a comprehensive, program-wide perspective. It must be complete, including teaching skills and knowledge from both individual program areas as well as the college "core." We must also be careful to eliminate redundant tasks requires for different portfolios. Our college-wide portfolio, as envisioned, is intended to serve the purpose of minimizing the overlap that exists among the multiple portfolios required throughout the college. We have been focusing our efforts on the realization of a portfolio that meets our expectations.

We believe, however, that our efforts are worthwhile; we reason that for undergraduates to engage in a two-year (at minimum) process of drafting and revising their portfolios, which involves them in an ongoing dialogue with peers and faculty, is to develop reflective, self-evaluative individuals who will, in turn, become conscientious, self-directed teachers who work within an educational community devoted to the education of all.

References

Alabama State Department of Education (1992). *Criteria for the Alabama Professional Education Personnel Evaluation System*. Montgomery, AL: Author.

Ash, B. H. (1994, February). A chronicle of change. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Sarasota, FL.

Association of Teacher Educators. (1988). *Teacher assessment*. Reston, VA: Author.

Barry, N. H. & Worden, T. (1994, February). Portfolios in preservice teacher education: Views from interns, university supervisors, and educational employers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Sarasota, FL.

Barton, J. & Collins, A. (1993). Portfolios in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(3), 200-210.

Berry, D., Kisch, J., Ryan, C., & Uphoff, J. (1991). *The process and product of portfolio construction*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL., April, 1991.

Bird, T. (1990). The schoolteacher's portfolio: An essay of possibilities. In J. Millman and L. Darling-Hammond (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Teacher Evaluation: Assessing Elementary and Secondary School Teachers*, 2nd ed., Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Bradley, A. (1992). Pilot test offers glimpse of board's teacher assessment. *Education Week, 12*(2).

Chiu, Y. C. (1989). An investigation of the relationships between the National

Teacher Examinations and a performance-based assessment of professional knowledge. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, Charlottesville.

Cole, D. J. (1992). *The developing professional: Process and product portfolios.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), San Antonio, TX.

Collins, A. (1991). Portfolios for biology teacher assessment. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 5*, 147-167.

Collins, A. (1990a). *Novices, Experts, Veterans, and Masters: The Role of Content and Pedagogical Knowledge in Evaluating Teaching.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Collins, A. (1990b). *Transforming the assessment of teachers: notes on a theory of assessment for the 21st century.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Catholic Education Association, Toronto, Canada.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1988). On teaching as a profession: A conversation with Linda Darling-Hammond. *Educational Leadership, 46*, 11-15, 17.

Delandshire, G. (1994). The assessment of teachers in the United States. *Assessment in Education, 1*(1), 95-113.

Dunn, C. & Shepperson, G. (1994, February). Practical concerns in developing preservice teacher education portfolios. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Sarasota, FL.

Elbow, P. (1991). Foreward in Belanoff, P. & Dickson, M. (Eds.), *Portfolios: Process and product.* Portsmouth, N.H.: Boynton/Cook.

Eissenburg, T. E., & Rudner, L. M. (1988). *State testing of teachers: A summary of current practices.* Washington, DC: American Institute for Research.

Furthwengler, C. (1986). *Multiple data sources in teacher evaluation.* Paper presented at the National Council on Measurement in Education, San Francisco, CA.

Haertel, E. (1991). New Forms of Teacher Assessment. In G. Grant (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education*, Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (1992). *Toward high and rigorous standards for the teaching profession.* (3rd edition). Detroit, MI: Author.

Quirk, T., Witten, B., & Weinberg, B. (1973). Review of studies of the concurrent and predictive validity of the National Teacher Examinations. *Review of Educational Research, 43*(l), 89-114.

Reynolds, A. (1992). What is Competent Beginning Teaching? A Review of the Literature. *Review of Educational Research, 62*(1), 1-35.

Sandefur, J. T. (1985). Competency assessment of teachers. *Action in Teacher Education, 7*(1), 1-6.

Scriven, M. (1988). Duty-based evaluation. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 1*(4), 319-334.

Shannon, D. M, & Boll, M. (March, 1995). Methods of Teacher Assessment: Theory vs. practice. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern educational Research Association, Hilton Head, SC.

Shannon, D. M, & Boll, M. (February, 1994). Preservice Teacher Evaluation: An overview. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research

Association, Sarasota, FL.

Shannon, D. M., Medley, D. M., & Hays, L. (1993a). Assessing Teacher's Functional Professional Knowledge. *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education, 7*(1), 7-20.

Shannon, D. M., Medley, D. M., & Hays, L. (1993b). The construct validity of a simulation exercise in classroom decision-making. *Journal of Educational Research, 86*(3), 180-183.

Shulman, L. S. (1989). The Paradox of Teacher Assessment, in *New Directions for Teacher Assessment* (pp. 13-27). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service,

Shulman, L. S. (1988). A union of insufficiencies: Strategies for teacher assessment in a period of educational reform. *Educational Leadership, 46*, 36-41.

Shulman, L. S. & Sykes, G. (1986). *A national board for teaching: In search of a bold standard.* Paper prepared for the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession, Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.

Smolen, L. & Newman, C. (1992). *Portfolios: An Estimate of Their Validity and Practicality.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Hilton Head, SC., February, 1992.

Wolf, K. (1991a). The schoolteacher's portfolio: Issues in Design, Implementation, and Evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappan, (73),* 129-136.

Wolf, K. (1991b). *Teaching Portfolios: Synthesis of Research and Annotated Bibliography.* San Francisco, CA: Far West Laboratory.

Zubizarreta, J. (1994). Teaching portfolios and the beginning teacher. *Phi Delta Kappan, (76),* 323-326.